

# THE ELEUSINIAN SANCTUARY DURING THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

KEVIN CLINTON

**T**he situation of the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis during the Peloponnesian War can best be appreciated against the background of its development from the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. (or earlier under Peisistratos) and the culmination of this development under Pericles.

The imposing Telesterion that was built in the sixth century, long associated by modern scholars with Peisistratos, is now being regarded as somewhat later, perhaps as late as the early years of the Kleisthenic democracy.<sup>1</sup> Not long afterwards, Triptolemos scenes on Attic vases take a new turn.<sup>2</sup> These scenes first start to appear ca. 540 B.C. (representing him as an agrarian hero, often accompanied by Demeter and Kore). Around 480, we see, now for the first time, on an Attic red-figure hydria by the Berlin Painter, Triptolemos pouring a libation, a *sponde*, as he leaves Eleusis to go off on his famous mission.<sup>3</sup> His mission was not only to distribute the grainseed, as in earlier representations, but now, it is clear, he has the additional task of announcing the Mysteries to the world (most famously to Herakles and the Dioskouroi). The libation scene alludes to his role as *spondophoros*, announcer of the Mysteries; his human counterparts were the *spondophoroi* of the Mysteries, sacred ambassadors who would announce each year throughout the Greek world the forthcoming celebration of the Mysteries and the start of the Sacred Truce.<sup>4</sup>

By the 460s, Athens was regarding the Sacred Truce of the Mysteries in the same way as the Eleans regarded the Olympic Truce. Violations of the Truce were punished by denying cities (i.e., their citizens) access to the

sanctuary. A law passed c. 460 tells us that the Truce of the Mysteries is to apply to "foreign initiates, *epoptai*, servants, and their baggage and to all Athenians."<sup>5</sup> The Truce is to be valid "among the cities that make use of the sanctuary and among Athenians in the same cities." Although the text is damaged in some sections, it mentions exclusion of cities from the sanctuary for improper conduct. This political use of the sanctuary in international relations confirms what is suggested by the late-sixth-century Telesterion and the Triptolemos scenes, namely that the sanctuary had by now achieved Panhellenic status. At this time it was the only Athenian festival that enjoyed such international repute. It is precisely this status that Pericles continued to promote when about fifteen years later he saw to it that the Telesterion was rebuilt, larger and more splendid than ever before.

At the end of the Persian Wars, the Eleusinian sanctuary must have been in a wretched state. The most important building in it, the Telesterion, no longer existed – because the Persians had burned it down, according to Herodotos (9.65.2); or, according to T. Leslie Shear, Jr., whose account seems more probable, because the Telesterion had been dismantled, but construction of its successor was cut short by the war.<sup>6</sup> The sanctuary must have had to make do with a temporary structure for decades. An abortive attempt to rebuild may well have occurred early in the regime of Pericles.<sup>7</sup> But it was definitely under Pericles, as Plutarch tells us (*Per.* 17.7), that the architect Koroibos began the reconstruction of the Telesterion, Metagenes added the *diazoma* and the upper columns, and Xenokles put on the lantern as the crowning touch. Thus was built this immense hall of initiation, enclosing an almost square interior space of approximately 2,600 m.<sup>2</sup>, with 42 interior columns, a veritable forest of columns; above them a second tier of columns supported the roof beams.<sup>8</sup> Its walls were lined with stone steps, which probably were not meant to be seats but to be stood upon, most likely by *epoptai*, while the first-time initiates circulated within the forest of columns below.<sup>9</sup>

Supporting evidence for the Periclean reconstruction comes from *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32, a decree that established at Eleusis officials called *epistatai*, whose task it was to be "in charge of the property of the Two Goddesses just as those (*epistatai*) in charge of works on the Acropolis were in charge of the Temple and the Statue."<sup>10</sup> The Temple and Statue on the Acropolis should be the Parthenon and Parthenos, the past tense indicating that those Acropolis *epistatai* functioned in the past.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the creation of the Eleusinian *epistatai* should be no earlier than the completion of the Parthenon in 433/2, just before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32 therefore should have been passed ca. 431, evidently 432/1. This document also called for an audit of funds expended in three Eleusinian sanctuaries: the main one at



Eleusis, the Eleusinion under the Acropolis, and the Eleusinion in Phaleron. In the course of this audit the architect Koroibos, presumably the same person as the one mentioned by Plutarch, was to be summoned by the auditors in connection with funds spent at the Eleusinion under the Acropolis.<sup>12</sup> Neither he nor anyone else was evidently going to be questioned about funds spent at Eleusis. The most probable inference is that the reason Koroibos was not questioned about expenses at Eleusis was the fact that he was no longer working there. Since according to this document no other architect was to be questioned about expenses at Eleusis, it is logical to assume that by the year 432/1 the Periclean Telesterion had long since been constructed. Its construction was evidently deemed so important that it proceeded roughly simultaneously with the Parthenon.

Thus it was probably already rebuilt (or nearly so) when the Athenians passed, no doubt with Pericles' encouragement, the law that revised the custom of the First Fruits (*aparche*), by reorganizing it to include the allies and even all Greek cities. The date of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32* provides important evidence for the date of this law, one of the most important Eleusinian documents of the fifth century. This document, the so-called First Fruits Decree (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 78*), specifies the amount of barley and wheat from the annual harvest to be contributed by each Attic deme as First-Fruits (*ἀπαρχή*) to Demeter and Kore at Eleusis – not only the demes, but Athenian allies as well. Finally, the decree proposes not to limit the request to the allies, but to ask *all* Greek cities, “not commanding them” (as the demes and allies were commanded) “but urging them to contribute if they wish.” The authority for this practice is “ancestral custom” (*τὰ πάτρια*) and “the oracle at Delphi.” Athens’ consultation of Delphi probably indicates that the ancestral practice was being expanded, the innovation involving (at least) the inclusion of the allies.<sup>13</sup> The procedures for carrying out the reorganization are described in detail, including construction of three storage chambers (*siroi*) in the sanctuary, sacrifices to be made from the First Fruits, and finally dedications to be financed from the sale of the grain and set up in the sanctuary. Amendments by Lampon, the well-known *mantis* who participated in the foundation of the Athenian colony at Thurii, addressed (1) publication of the decree, (2) intercalation of a new month of Hekatombaion (presumably to ensure arrival of the First Fruits by this month), (3) measures to protect the Pelargikon, and (4) preparation of a law concerning First Fruits of olive oil. The measures concerning the Pelargikon ordained that the *basileus* was to establish the boundaries of the sanctuaries (*τὰ ἱερά*) in the Pelargikon; in the future altars were not to be set up in the Pelargikon without the permission of the Boule and the

Demos, and no one was to cut building stones (λίθοι) from the Pelargikon nor remove earth or building stones.

This completely preserved decree, dated by historians anywhere from the early 440s to c. 415, is of such significance to the status of the sanctuary that it is worth discussing the date in some detail. According to the decree, the financial officials at Eleusis who are to administer the First Fruits at Eleusis are the *hieropoioi*. Maureen Cavanaugh, however, pointed out that these *hieropoioi* are the very officials whose financial responsibilities were abolished in 432/1 by the decree *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32*, discussed above.<sup>14</sup> The latter decree instituted a major change in the administration of the sanctuary. Previously, the *hieropoioi* of Eleusis were in charge of the finances of the sanctuary and managed the Eleusinian treasury on the Acropolis.<sup>15</sup> In *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32* this authority is taken away from them. Henceforth, the *epistatai* of Eleusis are to have complete control over the finances of the sanctuary – ἐπιστῆναι τοῖς χρέμασι τοῖς τοῖν θεοῖν. When the *epistatai* make expenditures they are to do so in consultation with the priests and the Boule (ἀναλίσκεν δὲ ὁ τι ἂν [μά]λιστα δέει μετὰ τῶν hieréon καὶ τῆς β[ολ]ῆς βουλευόμενος τὸ λοιπόν). The work of the *epistatai* is well illustrated in the preserved financial accounts, from a year of extremely limited activity like 408/7 (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 386/387*) to a year like 329/8 with its extensive operations (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1672*). In the First Fruits Decree, in contrast, in connection with expenditures on the *siroi* there is no mention of the *epistatai*: the *hieropoioi* appear to have direct access to the treasury of the Two Goddesses; they are to take money from the treasury and decide, together with the architect, on the location of the *siroi* (lines 10–12) – functions that should have fallen to the *epistatai* if they had existed. The First Fruits Decree therefore ought to pre-date 432/1 and thus must be a Periclean document. Margherita Guarducci, noting the function of the *epistatai* in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 391*, an account of transferral, from the *hieropoioi* to the *epistatai*, of proceeds from the sale of the *aparche* in the years 422/1–419/8, used the existence of the *epistatai* there and their absence in the First Fruits Decree as a solid argument for dating the First Fruits Decree before 422/1.<sup>16</sup> But she was apparently unaware of the existence of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32*, which decreed that the *epistatai* would be the sole financial officials of the Eleusinian sanctuary; had she been aware of it, she no doubt would have realized that her argument requires the First Fruits Decree to be placed also before *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32*. Silvio Accame was the first to recognize this critical importance of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32*,<sup>17</sup> and in this respect was followed by Cavanaugh.<sup>18</sup> Because *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32* probably belongs to the year 432/1, the First Fruits Decree should be dated c. 435, a date which Adolf Wilhelm regarded as epigraphically possible.<sup>19</sup>



Another significant consideration is that Lampon's amendment concerning the Pelargikon makes best sense if it belongs to a time before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War and the subsequent desecration of that sacred area. The precise location of the Pelargikon, which surrounded part or all of the Acropolis, is to some extent a matter of speculation.<sup>20</sup> At any rate, Lampon's amendment shows that at this time it was not an area that was closed off (people were freely able to remove stone and earth), a fact noted also by Thucydides (2.17.1) in the passage describing the flight of the residents of the countryside into the walled city:

The majority inhabited the vacant spaces in the city, as well as all the sanctuaries and hero shrines except the Acropolis and the Eleusinion and any other one that was securely closed off. The so-called Pelargikon beneath the Acropolis, even though it was both accursed to inhabit it and a tag-end of a Pythian oracle was forbidding it, saying "The Pelargikon is better (left) unworked," nevertheless was completely inhabited because of the immediate crisis.<sup>21</sup>

It is hard to see in the measures contained in Lampon's amendment anything that was intended to address the situation created by the numerous refugees from the Attic countryside who crowded into the Pelargikon and set up living quarters. Although Lampon's statute aims at maintaining the *integrity* of the Pelargikon (the level of concern is reflected in the steepness of the penalty, 500 drachmas), it does not attempt to close off the Pelargikon or even forbid people to live there. In view of this concern for the physical condition and integrity of the area, it would seem to make little sense to propose an amendment such as this, which does not address the condition to which the squatters had reduced it, if indeed this condition existed. In fact, if such massive violations of the ancient prohibition had occurred within the last few years, some reaffirmation of the ancient prohibition  $\mu\eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \tau\omicron\ \text{Πελαργικῶ}$  ought to be the starting point in any new legislation that aimed at protecting the Pelargikon; this ancient prohibition should have priority over statutes about boundaries of sanctuaries, altars, and removal of earth and stone. But there is no indication in the amendment that habitation has been a problem. Thus this amendment ought to belong to a time when people were not living in the Pelargikon or when such problematic habitation was not foreseen. The most appropriate time, therefore, would seem to be before the Peloponnesian War.<sup>22</sup>

One serious problem with which Lampon is dealing, namely the removal of earth and building stone, is, as Loeschke observed, more likely connected,

logically, with a substantial building project than with the makeshift dwellings of the refugees within the Pelargikon. Loeschke therefore conjectured that the project was the construction of the Propylaia by Mnesicles, beginning in 437.<sup>23</sup> In any case, whether there was a specific building project or not, Lampon's proposal to establish the boundaries of the sanctuaries within the Pelargikon and prohibit building altars seems most likely intended to limit construction and construction works (ἔργα) within the Pelargikon.<sup>24</sup> These measures with regard to the Pelargikon are precisely the sort that one would expect in response to an oracle that decreed "τὸ Πελαργικὸν ἄργον ἄμεινον." The oracle goes a step further than the old prohibition μὴ οἰκεῖν (μὴ οἰκεῖν would not prevent the quarrying of building stone [λίθοι] or removal of soil). Quarrying and removal of earth and stone are ἔργα, activities that were banned by the oracle (ἄργον ἄμεινον). Thus Lampon's measures can be seen as translating into law the directives of the oracle, in fact just what we should expect of a *mantis* with his special relationship to Apollo.

It would be helpful to know the date of this oracle of which Thucydides gives us only the final part (ἄκροτελεύτιον). It was given to Athens before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, but Thucydides does not specify how long before, only that it was still felt to have force (διεκώλυε). The oracle that authorized the First Fruits Decree was most likely given not long before the Decree, which translated Delphic authorization into law. All of Lampon's amendments should, as Foucart recognized, relate to an oracle concerning First Fruits, and they all can be seen to relate fairly obviously – except for the measures concerning the Pelargikon. Yet even those measures ought to be related somehow to the oracle; otherwise it would make little sense to include them in the amendment. Foucart offered the attractive hypothesis that the final part of the oracle on First Fruits was precisely the tag-end that Thucydides quoted.<sup>25</sup> In any case, whether the ἄκροτελεύτιον was attached to the oracle on First Fruits or not, Lampon's amendment concerning the Pelargikon can be most easily interpreted as executing in law the intent of the ἄκροτελεύτιον.

In spirit, as Cavanaugh and others have pointed out, the First Fruits Decree is of a piece with Pericles' call for a Panhellenic Congress, to discuss "the rebuilding of temples destroyed by the Persians, the offering of sacrifices vowed during the Persian Wars, and the maintenance of peace in the sea."<sup>26</sup> This call for a congress must have occurred before the start of construction on the Parthenon in 447. Another Periclean effort, in similar spirit, was the foundation of Thurii in 446 or 444, a colony that was to be, as Victor Ehrenberg described it, "Athenian in leadership and Panhellenic in its composition."<sup>27</sup> The colony's *oikistes* was the well-known Athenian seer,



Lampon. The First Fruits Decree is another example of this Panhellenic policy. Because Lampon is mentioned in the First Fruits Decree as the proposer of an amendment, it seems best to assume that his involvement with Thuri occurred earlier, and that the First Fruits Decree should be dated to the early or mid 430s.

In the domain of architecture, the First Fruits Decree gives a further example of Periclean design for Eleusis, in calling for the *hieropoioi* and the architect to build three storerooms, called *siroi*, to hold the grain deposited by Athenians, their allies, and all other Greek cities. Thus, when Athens' allies and all Greeks were called upon to deliver their First Fruits to Eleusis in the early or mid 430s, they were not delivering them to a sanctuary that lacked its most critical building, the Telesterion, but to a sanctuary with a Telesterion that was at that time the second largest enclosed assembly hall in the Greek world.<sup>28</sup> The Hellenes were expected to return a tithe of the agrarian wealth to the Two Goddesses who first gave it to them – agrarian wealth personified in the god Ploutos, represented most strikingly, standing between Demeter and Kore, in the Great Eleusinian Relief (Color Pl. 3). The relief is usually acknowledged to be a work of the 430s.<sup>29</sup>

This glorious era for the Mysteries came to an end with the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Surely there was no collection of First Fruits in years when Attica was invaded in the spring, around the time of the harvest, viz. in 431, 430, 428, 427, and 425,<sup>30</sup> and hence no splendid dedication from the First Fruits in these years.<sup>31</sup> The plague struck in 430. Its devastating effect on the populace is graphically described by Thucydides: "All the supplications at the sanctuaries and all inquiries at the oracles and such things were of no help, and finally the people gave them up, overcome by the evil" (2.47.4). Half a century earlier, on the eve of the naval battle of Salamis, Demeter and Kore intervened to help destroy the Persian fleet (Hdt. 8.65), but now, in the early years of the Archidamian War, the Two Goddesses failed to help. It is probably safe to assume that during most of the Archidamian War the custom of First Fruits was suspended. Suspension need not imply thorough devastation of agriculture in Attica but could have been brought about by the disruption or (in expectation of invasion) uncertainty of the harvest, the flight of many farmers into the city, the difficulty posed for the demes to organize the collection of First Fruits in such circumstances, and reluctance to spare precious grain for unresponsive gods. Toward the end of the Archidamian War, when our epigraphic records at Eleusis again have clear dates, in 421,<sup>32</sup> we see that the First Fruits were now being offered, but the custom of offering a dedication from them had evidently been suspended (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 391). Proceeds

from the First Fruits (most likely after expenses for sacrifices) amounted in this year to the miserable sum of 6 drachmas; in the following year it went up only to 31 drachmas.<sup>33</sup>

This situation probably reflects both the state of Athenian agriculture and the fact that donations of First Fruits were at best unorganized. It may also reflect the residual effects of the plague on the religious institutions of the city, effects that have been documented in other cults by Jon Mikalson.<sup>34</sup> In the case of the Two Goddesses and the Mysteries we know that one remedy was to enlist, at the first opportunity, the aid of Asklepios.<sup>35</sup> The Eleusinian priestly clans collaborated with the officials at Epidauros to bring him to Athens in 420. Their plan was probably to have him intimately associated with Demeter and Kore at the Eleusinion. But things did not work out precisely as planned, and Asklepios wound up in a sanctuary some distance away, on the south slope of the Acropolis.<sup>36</sup> In any case, the enthusiastic recourse to Asklepios suggests that the reputation of the Two Goddesses had suffered and needed some help from the Healer, the most *philanthropos* of the gods.

Life in the sanctuary and public interest of course continued. In 422 a bridge was authorized to be built over the Rheitos along the Sacred Way to Eleusis, near the eastern limit of the Thriasian Field (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 79*).<sup>37</sup> Fragments of financial accounts from the sanctuary can be dated with some probability to the interval between the Archidamian and Dekeleian Wars.<sup>38</sup> But in the Dekeleian War the Spartan garrison rendered travel in the country very difficult. Plutarch (*Alcibiades* 34) informs us that, with the Spartans controlling the passes to Eleusis, the Athenians were forced, during the Mysteries, to make the journey to Eleusis by sea, thus abandoning the traditional procession headed by Iakchos with all its festivities – sacrifices, dances, and various rites along the Sacred Way. However, in the fall of 407, Alcibiades, shortly after his return to Athens, revived the procession for this year's celebration of the festival, by having the army provide an escort along the Sacred Way to Eleusis and, at the close of the Mysteries, back to Athens (Plut. *Alc.* 34; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.20). For the preceding year, 408/7, we have an almost complete financial document from the sanctuary (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 386/387*); it confirms that the celebration had been much reduced in the years when the procession went by sea. The document is unusual in combining both inventory (*paradosis*) and financial account (*logos*). This combination was quite convenient in this year, because, as the document reveals, there was hardly any activity between the end of the preceding year, 409/8, and the end of the current one, 408/7. The entry for First Fruits (*aparche*) shows no change between the beginning



and the end of the year. The Spartan occupation had hindered the normal operation of the sanctuary to such an extent that the only expenses recorded in this year pertained essentially to work done at the sanctuary immediately before the Mysteries to prepare for the festival.<sup>39</sup>

The relative powerlessness of the Two Goddesses at this time seems also to be reflected in Attic vase painting. In a monograph on the image of Triptolemos on Athenian vases, Tetsuhiro Hayashi lists only two Triptolemos scenes for the last quarter of the fifth century, compared to thirty-one for the third quarter and fifty-three red-figured scenes for the second quarter.<sup>40</sup> Precise assignment of vases to a particular quarter is obviously not always possible, and these figures cannot be considered hard and fast. Though it may be argued that a few more Triptolemos scenes belong to the last quarter, the paucity of Triptolemos scenes in this quarter nevertheless is striking and undeniable.

Various reasons have been put forward, such as that now there was less interest in an agrarian hero and more interest in a blessed afterlife,<sup>41</sup> or the rather improbable suggestion that the Mysteries were changing from an agrarian cult into a mystery cult (as if that had not already happened).<sup>42</sup> Nor does the overall diminished production of Attic vases in this period explain such a pronounced reduction in Triptolemos scenes.<sup>43</sup> It is tempting to think that the reason may have been relatively simple, namely that agriculture in Attica was now in a sad state and collection of First Fruits was greatly diminished (judging by *IGI*<sup>3</sup> 391, noted above). Demeter and Kore had, to all appearances, failed to provide help in the years of the plague and invasions and now attracted less devotion. The Eleusinian sanctuary had little to boast about, and in these times it was probably impractical to send out heralds to announce the Mysteries and unreasonable to expect other cities to send First Fruits to Eleusis. It would not be surprising if the old image of Triptolemos setting forth triumphantly, on a mission now difficult to contemplate, had fallen out of favor with artists and public. Even though, in 420, Eleusinian officials succeeded in bringing Asklepios from the Piraeus to the Eleusinion to become associated with the Mysteries, the Dekeleian War soon put an end to hopes for a new era.

Marble reliefs, however, seem to offer a brighter picture, as Carol Lawton points out.<sup>44</sup> For the period c. 420–405 she lists eleven reliefs dedicated to Demeter, Kore, and other Eleusinian deities, more reliefs than to any other deity at Athens in this period except Athena, who has twenty to her credit. Judging by these numbers, affection for the Two Goddesses was on the rise. Thus the paucity of Triptolemos scenes on vases in the last quarter of the fifth century may not be an accurate indicator of religious feeling. But Triptolemos

appears in only three of the reliefs (and perhaps also in the missing part of some fragmentary reliefs), and it needs to be emphasized that only two or three preserved reliefs come from the Eleusinian sanctuary.<sup>45</sup>

Although it seems risky to rely on artistic representations to get an accurate picture of Athenian religious feeling,<sup>46</sup> all of the available information – literary, epigraphic, and artistic – suggests that the custom of First Fruits had suffered considerably during the Peloponnesian War: it was at least problematic (possibly even non-existent) during the Archidamian War; was being revived during the Peace of Nicias (along with other signs of revival such as the bridge over the Rheitos [Color Pl. 5]); but did not exist during the Dekeleian War, nor did the Procession at the Mysteries (with the minor exception in 407). With failure in collection of First Fruits the symbolic bond between the Two Goddesses and Attic agriculture surely was weakened, and inasmuch as Triptolemos, as distributor of Demeter's gift of grain, was closely associated with Attic agriculture, it would not be surprising if he too suffered as a symbol. Thus, at the end of the regime of Pericles the sanctuary seems to have fallen upon one of the most difficult periods in its history.

The actual history in detail of the sanctuary and its cults during the War must have been fascinating. The status of the sanctuary was clearly in flux, dependent on the changing fortunes of Athens. It should not be forgotten that there is no evidence that the annual celebration of the Mysteries was ever suspended during the War. Nor is there any sign that there was a break in the recording of the annual accounts, even during the Dekeleian War, when annual operations were limited to the celebration of the festival and the days immediately preceding. On the other hand, the account of 408/7, when compared to a fairly full account of a more normal year, like 329/8 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1672*), suggests, by its silence, that other festivals that normally took place at the sanctuary, such as the Haloa, were in abeyance. Thus the picture is rather complex, as we should expect. It is impossible to know, despite the dismal picture drawn by Thucydides, how deeply the devotion of Athenians to Demeter and Kore was affected by the plague, and how quickly it was recovering. Devotion continued through the plague despite the setbacks.

In the Periclean period, the agrarian prosperity promised by the Two Goddesses – perhaps best exemplified by the Great Eleusinian Relief featuring Demeter, Ploutos (Wealth), and Kore (Color Pl. 3) – and the optimism that the cult inspired continued to put the Mysteries at the center of the city's Panhellenic ambitions. But at the end of that glorious period the sanctuary and cult suffered significantly, and did not fully recover until the next century.<sup>47</sup>



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Accame, S. 1955. "Note per la storia della Pentecontaetia: il decreto sulle primizie alle divinità eleusine." *RivFil* 33: 153–63.
- Beschi, L. 1967–68. "Il monumento di Telemachos, fondatore dell' Asklepieion Ateniese." *ASAtene* 29–30: 381–436.
- Brunt, P. A. 1993. *Studies in Greek History and Thought*. Oxford.
- Bundgaard, J. A. 1976. *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights*. Copenhagen.
- Cavanaugh, M. B. 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Second Half of the Fifth Century B.C.* Atlanta.
- Clinton, K. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. *TAPS*, 64.3. Philadelphia.
1987. "The Date of the Classical Telesterion at Eleusis." In *Φίλια Έπη (Studies Mylonas)* 2, 254–62. Athens.
1992. *Myth and Cult: the Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. *SkrAth* 8°, 11. Stockholm.
- 1994a. "The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens." In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy, Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4–6, 1992*, edited by W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. L. Shear, Jr., H. A. Shapiro, and F. Frost, 161–72. Oxford.
- 1994b. "The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asklepios in Athens." In *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, edited by R. Hägg, 17–34. *SkrAth* 8°, 13. Stockholm.
2004. "Epiphany in the Eleusinian Mysteries." *ICS* 29: 85–109.
2005. *Eleusis, The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme 1a–b*. Athens.
- forthcoming a. *Eleusis, The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme 2*. Athens.
- forthcoming b. "The Eleusinian Aparche in Practice." In *Ιερά και λατρείες της Δήμητρας στον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο*, edited by I. Leventi. Volos.
- Clinton, K., and O. Palagia. 2003. "The Boy in the Great Eleusinian Relief." *AM* 118: 263–80.
- Comella, A. 2002. *I rilievi votivi greci di periodo arcaico e classico: diffusione, ideologia, committenza*. Bari.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1948. "The Foundation of Thurii." *AJP* 69: 149–70.
- Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Foucart, P. 1880. "Inscription d'Éleusis du Vme siècle." *BCH* 4: 225–56.
- Guarducci, M. 1961 "Intorno al decreto ateniese sulle primizie per le dèe di Eleusi." *RivFil* 89: 283–95.
- Hayashi, T. 1992. *Bedeutung und Wandel des Triptolemosbildes vom 6.-4. Jh. v. Chr. Beiträge zur Archäologie* 20. Würzburg.
- Iakovides, S. E. 1962. *Η μυκηναϊκή Ακρόπολις των Αθηνών*. Athens.
- Keramopoulos, A. 1932. "Το Πελαργικόν." *PrakAkAth* 7: 110–24.
- Lawton, C. 1999. "Votive reliefs and popular religion in the Athenian Agora: the case of Asklepios and Hygieia." In *Proceedings of the XVth international Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam (July 12–17, 1998)*, edited by R. F. Docter and E. M. Moormann, 232–4. Amsterdam.
- Löschcke, G. 1883. "Die Enneakrunosepisode bei Pausanias." Diss. Univ. Dorpatensis. Tartu.
- Matthaiou, A. P. 2004. "Περί της IG I<sup>3</sup> 11." In *ΑΤΤΙΚΑΪ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΑΪ. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εις μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864–1950)*, edited by A. P. Matthaiou, 99–122. Athens.
- Mattingly, H. B. 1993. "New light on the Athenian standards decree." *Klio* 75: 99–102.
- Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*<sup>2</sup> Oxford.

- Meritt, B. D., and H. T. Wade-Gery. 1963. "The Dating of Documents to the Mid-Fifth Century, II." *JHS* 83: 111–14.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1983. "Religion and the Plague in Athens, 431–423 BC." In *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow*, *GRBM* 10, 217–25. Durham, NC.
- Miles, M. M. 1998. *The City Eleusinion, Agora XXXI*. Princeton.
- Mylonas, G. E. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1935. "Die eleusinische Gottheiten." *ArchRW* 32: 79–141.
- Peschlow-Bindokat, A. 1972. "Demeter und Persephone in der attischen Kunst des 6. bis 4. Jahrhunderts." *Jdl* 87: 60–157.
- Philios, D. 1895. "Δύο ελευσινιακά ανάγλυφα." *AM* 20: 245–66.
- Rubel, A. 2000. *Stadt in Angst: Religion und Politik in Athen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges*. Darmstadt.
- Schwarz, G. 1987. *Triptolemos, Ikonographie einer Agrar- und Mysteriengottheit Grazer Beiträge*, Supplement 2. Horn-Graz.
- Shear, T. L. 1982. "The Demolished Temple at Eleusis." In *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson*. *Hesperia* Supplement 20, 141–54. Princeton.
- Travlos, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. London.
- Wilhelm, A. 1903. "Inschrift aus Athen." *Wjh* 6: 10–15.
- Ziehen, L. 1906. *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e Titulis Collectae*. Leipzig.

#### NOTES

1. See Shear (1982, 131), attributing it to the sons of Peisistratos; Hayashi (1992, 20–3), dating the ram's head on the sima of this Telesterion to the last decade of the sixth century; Clinton (1994a, 162), arguing for dating the fortification wall of the sanctuary after 506. (The Spartan king Kleomenes I in 506, according to Hdt. 6.75.3, sacked the *temenos* of the Two Goddesses; according to Paus. 3.4.2, he devastated the *chora*, including the Orgas sacred to the Eleusinian deities. The *temenos* therefore was more likely the Orgas than the sanctuary.)
2. On the development of vase scenes of Triptolemos, see Clinton 1994a, 164–9; Hayashi 1992; Schwarz 1987, 237–46.
3. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 2696; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 210,181; Schwarz 1987, 36, V 42; Hayashi 1992, 136, no. 39. Miles 1998, 53, notes that at the time of the creation of this vase the Temple of Triptolemos was under construction in the City Eleusinion.
4. On the *spondophoroi*, see Clinton 1974, 23; 1992, 80 (Triptolemos as *spondophoros*); 1994a, 163; Clinton forthcoming a, Introduction.
5. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6 (= Clinton 2005, no. 19), now preserved among the Elgin marbles in the British Museum; for discussion, see Clinton 1994a, 162–3.
6. Shear 1982.
7. The "Ictinian Telesterion"; see Mylonas 1961, 113–17.
8. The "forest of columns" evidently resumes a similar feature of the late-sixth-century Telesterion (on its date, see above, n. 1). An even larger forest of columns (90), with similar intercolumniation, is contained within the Odeum of Pericles; Travlos, 1971, 387–91.
9. On the function of the steps, see Clinton 2004.
10. See Cavanaugh 1996, 19–27, 84–95; Clinton 1987; 2005, no. 30. Mattingly (1993) demonstrated that relying on the three-barred sigma as a certain indication of a date no later than 446, as Meritt and Wade-Gery (1963) did in the case of *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32, was misguided. Matthaiou (2004) has now provided additional convincing evidence that the three-barred sigma cannot serve as a firm criterion for a date. David Lewis, one of the last major supporters of Meritt's and Wade-Gery's use of the three-barred sigma, told me in a personal message, not long before he died, "I regard Mattingly's



- argument about the Hamaxitos fragment in *Klio* as convincing, and am contemplating the psychological block which took me 90% of the way when dealing with it and not the other 10%."
11. Miles (1998, 42 n. 20) argues for a date shortly before or after 447, because "phrasing (in the imperfect tense) would be most appropriate before the actual construction on the Parthenon, or shortly after it began in 447, because in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32* the preserved accounts for it and for the statue show separate boards of *epistatai*, and the statue was finished in 438." Although it is certainly true that the statue was completed in 438, the "phrasing" refers to *both* boards, and the termination of both boards occurred in 433/2 when the *epistatai* in charge of the Parthenon finished their work (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 450*); after this point the reference to both boards in the imperfect would be most appropriate. See further discussion of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 32* by Clinton forthcoming a, no. 30.
  12. There is a problem in that Plutarch stated that Metagenes and Xenokles finished the Telesterion after Koroibos died. So either Plutarch was wrong (Koroibos merely left the project, so Clinton 1987), or the Koroibos of the decree was a relative; cf. Clinton forthcoming a, no. 30.
  13. Cf. Athens' consultation of Delphi regarding a change in status of the Sacred Orgas in 352, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 204* (= Clinton 2005, no. 144).
  14. Cavanaugh 1996, 19–27, 84–95. Her review of the scholarship on dating this document is the most complete one available.
  15. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 6.C.36–38* (= Clinton 2005, no. 19): τὸ δὲ ἀργυρίον τὸς ἱεροποιοῦς τ[ὸ] το[ῖν] θεῶν ἐμ] πόλει ταμιεύεσθ[αι].
  16. Guarducci 1961, 288: "Se, insomma, il decreto fosse, come ritiene il Körte, posteriore al resoconto, una menzione degli epistatai vi sarebbe stata presso che inevitabile."
  17. Accame 1955, 153–6.
  18. Cavanaugh 1996, 61–3, but she pointed out the difficulty with Accame's dating of the First Fruits Decree itself to 448 and its amendment to the years after the Peace of Nikias.
  19. Wilhelm 1903, 15. Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 222–3, agreed, in their review of the evidence for the date: "... we are not convinced that a date even as early as 435 is formally impossible." They did not mention Guarducci's and Accame's argument about the absence of the *epistatai* but focused instead on other aspects of these scholars' conclusions.
  20. See bibliography and discussion in Travlos 1971, 55. Keramopoulos 1932, who fully discussed the literary evidence, showed that it must exist below and near the Acropolis, and argued that it completely surrounded the Acropolis; more recently, Beschi 1967–68, Iakovides 1962, and Travlos, *loc. cit.*, argued with some success for an area that extended roughly halfway around the Acropolis, viz. the western end.
  21. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τὰ τε ἔρῃμα τῆς πόλεως ᾤκησαν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰ ἡρώια πάντα πλὴν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως καὶ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο βεβαίως κληστὸν ἦν· τὸ τε Πελαργικὸν καλούμενον τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, ὃ καὶ ἐπάρατόν τε ἦν μὴ οἰκεῖν καὶ τι καὶ Πυθικοῦ μαντείου ἀκροτελεύτιον τοιόνδε διεκώλυε, λέγον ὡς "τὸ Πελαργικὸν ἄργον ἄμεινον," ὅμως ὑπὸ τῆς παραχρῆμα ἀνάγκης ἐξωκλήθη.
  22. After I reached this conclusion, I noticed that Bundgaard 1976, 147–8, independently came to the same conclusion, using precisely the same reasoning.
  23. Löschcke, 1883, 18–20. Ziehen 1906, 23 (no. 4), agreed with his reasoning but could not contemplate a date so early.
  24. Because the boundaries of various sanctuaries within the Pelargikon were not fixed, evidently anyone could set up an altar on undefined land and thereby create a new sanctuary, into which additional structures might be introduced.
  25. Foucart 1880, 254–6: "Je suppose qu'après avoir répondu aux Athéniens qu'ils devaient consacrer aux déesses les prémices des fruits qu'elles leur avaient donnés, la Pythie, par une addition dont nous avons des exemples, ajoutait qu'il y aurait profit à ne pas toucher

- au Pélasgicon." Fontenrose 1978, 327, Q181, dates the ἀκροτελεύτιον "probably before 490," without giving a reason.
26. Cavanaugh 1996, 81–5.
27. Ehrenberg 1948, 119.
28. Rather larger, with a similar plan (see n. 8), and with its rear also carved out of the hill behind it, was, interestingly enough, another building constructed under Pericles, his Odeum.
29. Athens, National Museum 126. On the identification of the boy in the relief as Ploutos, see now Clinton and Palagia 2003; Clinton 1992, 39–55.
30. On the damage cf. Brunt 1993, 96–7.
31. Although the First Fruits Decree mentions dedications in the plural, our most complete evidence of the actual practice (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672) describes only a single dedication from the proceeds of the sale of the *aparche* (after expenses for sacrifices and related matters); see Clinton forthcoming b.
32. Fragments of accounts can be assigned with some plausibility to the years of the Archidamian War: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 392–394, 399–401; for texts and discussion, see Clinton 2005 and forthcoming a, nos. 32–8, 42. No record of First Fruits has been preserved from this period.
33. See Clinton forthcoming a, no. 45.
34. Mikalson 1983.
35. Clinton 1994b, with bibliography; for a recent review of the arrival of Asklepios, Rubel 2000, 244–8, including bibliography since Clinton 1994b.
36. Clinton 1994b, 32–3, noted that there must have been an intention to locate Asklepios' sanctuary in or near the Eleusinion, but that this may not have been realized (it was certainly the case that his statue was taken by Telemachos from the Eleusinion to the south slope of the Acropolis); Lawton, 1999 and Ch. 4, argues that despite the removal of the statue a sanctuary for him was indeed established in the Eleusinion.
37. See Clinton 2005 and forthcoming a, no. 41 for text and discussion.
38. See Clinton 2005 and forthcoming a, nos. 42–3, 46–8, 50 for texts and discussion.
39. See Cavanaugh 1996 and Clinton 2005 and forthcoming a, no. 50 for texts and discussion.
40. Hayashi 1992, 65, 160–1.
41. Nilsson 1935, 130; *GGR*<sup>3</sup> 805.
42. Peschlow-Bindokat 1972, 109.
43. Hayashi 1992, 70.
44. Ch. 4.
45. Lawton, Ch. 4 lists three reliefs. The dedication by Pythodoros (Color Pl. 4) of a battle scene (Lawton, Ch. 4, no. 28; Goette, Ch. 8, pp. 198–9; Clinton 2005, no. 39) was not found in the sanctuary but in a Byzantine wall on the property of "Ioannis Rigo"; it is not mentioned in any of D. Philios' excavation reports and not published among his editions of inscriptions from the sanctuary, and so the restoration τοῖν Θεοῖν, though retained in my text, is not certain; the god(s) to whom it was dedicated may have been different (e.g. Hippothon). It is not clear in the dedication by Platthis (Lawton, Ch. 4, no. 29; Clinton 2005, no. 44) that the figure next to Kore is Triptolemos (rather than Demeter); Philios (1895, 258 n. 20), who first published it, thought it more likely that the figure is Demeter; Comella (2002, 209–19, no. 2) leaves the matter open.
46. Miles 1998, 53–5, points out that choice of vase scenes such as those featuring Triptolemos may have been affected by customers, such as the Etruscans.
47. Thanks are due to Olga Palagia for her comments and to Carol Lawton for showing me a copy of her contribution.